

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 are pending and rejected. In this response, no claims are amended or cancelled. Thus, claims 1-20 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 5,857,189 to Riddle (“Riddle”). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6 of the present application are not obvious under double patenting rejections in view of Riddle. Specifically, for example, claim 1 of the present application requires “copying the file... when the user attempts to open the file from the file sharing window” and “changing the representation ... to allow the copied file to be directly opened from the local computer via the alias in the file sharing window.” It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are not in the claims 1-3 of Riddle. Therefore, claims 1-6 of the present application are not obvious in view of Riddle. If the Office Action maintains such a double patenting rejection, a terminal disclaimer will be submitted when the present application is in condition of allowance.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 7-16 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,793,365 to Tang, et al. (“Tang”).

Claims 7 and 10:

Applicant submits that independent claims 7 and 10 include limitations not disclosed or suggested by Tang. Specifically, independent claim 7 recites as follows:

A computer system comprising:

a teleconferencing application having a teleconferencing window to display video images received from a remote computer via a teleconferencing communications link; and

an accessory application having an accessory window, the accessory application to execute separately from the teleconferencing application, to provide at least one accessory function to the teleconferencing application by handling data transmitted to or from the teleconferencing application, and to display information descriptive of the handled data in the accessory window.

(emphasis added).

Independent claim 7 includes the following limitations: first, the teleconferencing application has a window so that video images received from a remote computer can be displayed; second, the accessory application has an accessory window within which both the handled data and the information descriptive of the handled data will be displayed. Applicant submits that claim 7 is not anticipated by Tang because Tang does not disclose a computer system that includes the above-mentioned limitations.

According to the Office Action (see e.g., 6/4/2007 Office Action, page 4), the communications application and the gallery window taught by Tang are equivalent to the teleconferencing application and the accessory application in claim 7, respectively. However, Tang fails to teach that the communication application has a window to display video images received from other computers (see e.g., Tang, col. 12, lines 61-67; col. 13, lines 1-4), whereas the teleconferencing application recited in claim 7 has the limitation of a teleconferencing window. Furthermore, the gallery window taught by Tang just shows the visual representations of selected other members of the workgroup (see e.g., Tang, col. 3, lines 38-41), and the gallery window is not capable of displaying any descriptive information.

According to Tang, in order to show the information about a worker displayed in the gallery window, another child window, named as “the selected worker’s business card 29,” needs to be displayed by clicking the information button 20 in the gallery window (see e.g., Tang, col. 7, lines 56-61). By contrast, the accessory application recited in claim 7 of the present application displays both the handled data and the information descriptive of the handled data just within one window, the accessory window. Therefore, independent claim 7 is not anticipated by Tang.

Applicant submits that independent claim 10 includes similar limitations as of claim 7. Therefore, for the reason similar to those discussed above, claim 10 is also not anticipated by Tang.

Claims 13 and 15:

Applicant submits that independent claims 13 and 15 are not anticipated by Tang.

Specifically, independent claim 13 recites as follows:

A method of providing a status of a file shared via a file sharing window of a teleconferencing application comprising:
displaying a file sharing window of a teleconferencing application;
displaying in the file sharing window a representation of a shared file and an indication of a number of users of a plurality of remote computers who have copied the shared file; and
updating the indication of the number of users who have copied the shared file responsive to the shared file being copied to one of the remote computers.

(emphasis added).

As shown, independent claim 13 includes a limitation of displaying and updating an indication that will reflect “the number of users who have copied the shared file...,” which is absent from Tang. Tang only teaches a method of determining the number of users in a chat

room window based on whether a user joins or leaves the chat room (see e.g., Tang, col. 11, lines 49-57). Tang's method does not teach at all how to display or update the number of users who have accessed a particular data item.

Applicant submits that independent claim 15 includes similar limitations as of claim 13. For the reason similar to those discussed above, claim 15 is also not anticipated by Tang.

Claims 19 and 20:

Applicant submits that independent claims 19 and 20 include limitations not disclosed or suggested by Tang and they are not anticipated by Tang. Specifically, for example, independent claim 19 recites as follows:

A method for mirroring events between a plurality of computers in a teleconference communicatively coupled via a teleconferencing application executing on each of the plurality of computers, the method comprising:

detecting events in a first window on a first computer of the plurality of computers;

converting the detected events into video streaming data;

transmitting the video streaming data from the first computer to the teleconferencing applications on each of the plurality of computers other than the first computer; and

displaying in a window on each of the plurality of computers other than the first computer the video streaming data representing the detected events from the first computer to allow users of the plurality of computers other than the first computer to observe in the window the detected events from the first window on the first computer.

(emphasis added).

As shown, independent claim 19 includes the limitations of “detecting events in a first window on a first computer...,” “converting the detected events into video streaming data,” transmitting the video streaming data...,” and “displaying in a window on each of the plurality of computers other than the first computer the video streaming data representing the detected events from the first computer...”

Applicant respectfully submits that Tang does not disclose a method of detecting an

event on a computer, converting the event into video streaming data, and transmitting and displaying the video streaming data on each of the multiple computers other than the computer from which the event is detected. Specifically, in column 6, lines 63-67, Tang only discloses a method of determining a user's level of activity information by tracking the keyboard activity, by determining the currently active application on the user's computer, or by analyzing a video image taken by a video camera in the office. Here, only a video image is needed instead of video stream data, where a video image is only one of many image frames in video stream data. Furthermore, the video image mentioned in this method either is used to determine which of the predetermined five levels of a user's activity information will be selected (column 7, lines 1-2), or is used for creating an icon to indicate the level of activity for a user (column 6, lines 20-26). In this method, Tang fails to teach how to detect and convert an event into the video stream data; nor does it teach how to transmit or display video stream data (not just one video image frame) from one computer to the other computers.

The video-conference display method taught by Tang (column 8, lines 29-51) is not functionally coupled to the method of determining a user's level of activity information as mentioned above. This video-conference display method disclosed by Tang displays the video stream data on "each of the participants of the video-conference" (column 8, lines 34-35), which lacks the limitation of "displaying in a window on each of the plurality of computers other than the first computer...," as recited in claim 19, where the first computer is the computer from which the event is detected.

Applicant submits that independent claim 20 includes similar limitations as of claim 19. For the reason similar to those discussed above, claim 20 is also not anticipated by Tang.

Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 16:

Given that claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 16 depend from one of the above independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 16 are also not anticipated by Tang.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,724,578 to Morinaga, et al. (“Morinaga”). Applicant submits that claims 17 and 18 are patentable over Tang in view of Morinaga. Specifically, independent claim 17 recites as follows:

A method of providing the status of a file shared via a file sharing window of a teleconferencing application comprising:

displaying on each of a plurality of computers a file sharing window for a teleconferencing application, the file sharing window including a representation of a shared file posted by a first user of a first computer of one of the plurality of computers;

deleting the representation of the shared file from the file sharing window on each of the computers when the first user removes the representation of the shared file from the file sharing window on the first computer; and

deleting the representation of the shared file only from the file sharing window on a second computer of the plurality of computers when a second user, who did not post the shared file, removes the representation of the shared file from the file sharing window on the second computer.

(emphasis added).

Independent claim 17 discloses a method of displaying a representation of a shared file in each file sharing window of all computers, and deleting the representation of the shared file by a user either from a file sharing window of a local computer or from all file sharing windows of all computers, depending upon who does the deletion and where the deletion takes place. When a user posts a shared file from a computer, the representation of the shared file will be displayed on each of the computers through a teleconferencing application. When the

user, who posted the shared file, deletes the shared file from the computer that was originally used to post the shared file, the representation of the shared file will be deleted from all file sharing windows of all computers. In other words, in order to remove the representation of the shared file from all file sharing windows of all computers, two conditions have to be satisfied: first, the user, who deletes the shared file, has to be the user who posted the file; second, the computer, from which the user deletes the shared file, has to be computer that was originally used to post the shared file. Otherwise, the representation of a shared file will just be deleted from a file sharing window of a local computer, not from all file sharing windows of all computers. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are absent from the cited references.

Tang teaches a system and a method that provide each network computer user with a user interface displaying visual representations of selected other computer users or data items (Abstract). Just as the Office Action pointed out, “Tang does not specifically teach how deleting is restricted.” (Page 7 of the Office Action). Morinaga only discloses a file management system managing a plurality of files shared among a plurality of users, where all the files, stored in the file server, can be linked together by choosing appropriate values for a file management table of each file (Abstract; column 4, lines 6-11; column 4, line 44 through column 5, line 41). Morinaga fails to mention any window operation in its disclosure and its file deletion operation has nothing to do with who posted the file and from which computer terminal the file was posted. There is no teaching or suggestion in Morinaga regarding how a file can be deleted from all computer terminals only by a user, who originally posted the file, at a computer from which the file was posted by the user. Because the files and the file management tables in Morinaga are all stored in the central file server, thus, according to Morinaga’s method, a user can delete a file and its associated files from the file server at any

one of terminal computers as long as the user has the deleting right for that file (column 4, lines 48-61). Once a file is deleted from the file server, no terminal computer is able to display or access the deleted file. By contrast, claim 17 teaches a deletion method that will only delete a representation of a shared file from all file sharing windows of all computers if the user is the one who posted the file and if the computer is the one that was used to post the shared file.

There is no motivation or suggestion, either in the cited references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the references teachings. Here, Tang does not suggest combining the visual computer user or data item displaying method with a deletion feature that will delete a file from all of the computers by a user who originally posted the file; nor does Morinaga suggest combining its file management system with the above-mentioned deletion feature through windows operations. In fact, in Morinaga, since all information is stored in the file server and all terminals are just used to display the information obtained from the file server, there is no need to distinguish from which computer terminal the file was originally posted or is to be deleted.

Even if Tang and Morinaga could be combined, the combined references still fail to teach or suggest all the limitations in independent claim 17, because the combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest that only a user who originally posted the file can delete the representation of a shared file from each computer when the deletion is performed from a computer that was originally used to post the file. Therefore, independent claim 17 is patentable over the cite references.

Independent claim 18 includes similar limitations as independent claim 17. Thus, for the reason similar to those discussed above, claim 18 is patentable over Tang in view of Morinaga.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call/email the undersigned attorney.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: September 4, 2007

/Kevin G. Shao/

Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095
Kevin_Shao@bstz.com

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300